

# Working Memory Maintenance Contributes to Long-term Memory Formation: Neural and Behavioral Evidence

Charan Ranganath, Michael X. Cohen, and Craig J. Brozinsky

## Abstract

■ Theories of human memory have led to conflicting views regarding the relationship between working memory (WM) maintenance and episodic long-term memory (LTM) formation. Here, we tested the prediction that WM maintenance operates in two stages, and that processing during the initial stage of WM maintenance promotes successful LTM formation. Results from a functional magnetic resonance imaging study showed that activity in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and hippocampus during

the initial stage of WM maintenance was predictive of subsequent LTM performance. In a behavioral experiment, we demonstrated that interfering with processing during the initial stage of WM maintenance impaired LTM formation. These results demonstrate that processing during the initial stage of WM maintenance directly contributes to successful LTM formation, and that this effect is mediated by a network that includes the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and the hippocampus. ■

## INTRODUCTION

Episodic long-term memory (LTM) refers to processes supporting the formation and retrieval of memories for events, and working memory (WM) refers to processes that enable the maintenance and manipulation of information across brief periods of time. Although several studies have separately characterized the neural mechanisms of WM maintenance (D'Esposito & Postle, 2000) and LTM formation (Paller & Wagner, 2002), little is known about whether or how these memory processes interact. Hebb (1949) proposed that WM maintenance might be accomplished through reverberating activity in neural cell assemblies, and that this reverberating activity might serve to strengthen LTM traces for corresponding items. This assumption was later incorporated into formal models of memory (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968), generating the prediction that the amount of time spent actively maintaining an item should enhance LTM task performance. However, studies testing this prediction yielded inconclusive results (Nairne, 1983; Craik & Watkins, 1973; Woodward, Bjork, & Jongeward, 1973), leading some to suggest that WM maintenance and LTM formation might be functionally and neurally independent (Craik, 2002; Baddeley, 2000; Craik & Lockhart, 1972; Baddeley & Warrington, 1970; Shallice & Warrington, 1970).

Previous studies examining interactions between WM and LTM have generally treated WM maintenance as a unitary process. However, recent findings suggest that WM maintenance may operate in two stages (Johnson, Reeder, Raye, & Mitchell, 2002; Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984b). In the initial stage of WM maintenance, one must actively transform a sensory representation into an internal code that can be maintained in the absence of external stimulation, whereas in the late stage, maintenance of this code proceeds relatively automatically (Jolicoeur & Dell'Acqua, 1998; Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984a, 1984b). Processes related to the initial stage of WM maintenance have been described variously as "recoding" (Miller, 1956), "refreshing" (Johnson, Mitchell, Raye, & Greene, 2004; Johnson, Raye, Mitchell, Greene, & Anderson, 2003; Johnson, Reeder, et al., 2002; Raye, Johnson, Mitchell, Reeder, & Greene, 2002; Johnson, 1992), and "short-term consolidation" (Jolicoeur & Dell'Acqua, 1998).<sup>1</sup> Results from one study suggest that processing during the initial stage of WM maintenance disproportionately promotes successful LTM formation relative to the late stage of WM maintenance (Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984b). These findings suggest that distinguishing between early and late WM maintenance processes should allow for a more definitive assessment of the relationship between WM maintenance and LTM formation.

If, as Hebb (1949) proposed, neural activity during WM maintenance serves to strengthen LTM traces, we would expect sustained activity during the early or late

---

Center for Neuroscience and Department of Psychology, University of California at Davis

stages of WM maintenance to be enhanced for items that are later remembered relative to items that are later forgotten. Furthermore, we would predict that disrupting the early or late stages of WM maintenance should impair LTM formation. Here, we tested these predictions in two experiments that required subjects to actively maintain novel visual objects across short memory delays. In Experiment 1, we used event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to identify regions where activity early and late in the memory delay was predictive of subsequent LTM performance (Figure 1A). In Experiment 2, we performed a behavioral study to test whether interfering with processing early or late in the memory delay would impair LTM formation (Figure 1B).

Previous work has demonstrated that activity in the prefrontal cortex (PFC) and medial-temporal lobes (MTL) during memory encoding is predictive of successful LTM formation (Davachi, Mitchell, & Wagner, 2003; Ranganath, Yonelinas, et al., 2003; Otten, Henson, & Rugg, 2001; Henson, Rugg, Shallice, Josephs, & Dolan, 1999; Brewer, Zhao, Desmond, Glover, & Gabrieli, 1998; Wagner et al., 1998) and that these regions exhibit persistent activity during active maintenance of novel

information (Park et al., 2003; Davachi & Wagner, 2002; Ranganath & D'Esposito, 2001; Stern, Sherman, Kirchoff, & Hasselmo, 2001). Accordingly, we predicted that, in Experiment 1, PFC and MTL subregions should play a critical role in mediating effects of WM maintenance on LTM formation. We further predicted that disrupting WM processing in Experiment 2 would result in impaired LTM formation.

## RESULTS

### Experiment 1: Behavioral Results


In this experiment, subjects were scanned while performing a delayed recognition task with trial-unique line drawings of complex objects (Figure 1A). Accuracy on this task was high ( $M = 92\%$ ,  $SE = 0.8\%$ ). There were no significant differences in accuracy or reaction times (RTs) for trials as a function of probe type (match vs. nonmatch) [Accuracy:  $t(14) = 1.58$ ,  $p > .10$ ; RT:  $t(14) < 1$ ] or delay length [Accuracy:  $F(3,42) = 2.78$ ,  $p = .09$ ; RT:  $F(3,42) = 1.71$ ,  $p > .15$ ].

Immediately after the scan session, subjects were given a surprise LTM test on objects presented during the scan. On this test, subjects saw a series of objects that were previously shown on WM trials as well as new foil objects. Subsequent LTM performance, assessed by postscan recognition confidence ratings, was high. Participants accurately recognized an average of 51.4% ( $SD = 16.7\%$ ) of the previously encountered objects with high confidence ratings of "1" or "2." In contrast, only 10.7% ( $SD = 5.4\%$ ) of foil objects were erroneously recognized with high confidence. The hit rate was significantly higher than the false alarm rate [ $t(14) = 11.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. LTM performance did not differ as a function of probe type [ $t(14) = 1.44$ ,  $p > .15$ ] or delay length [ $F(3,42) < 1$ ]. Consequently, fMRI analyses of subsequent memory effects were performed collapsing across these variables.

### Experiment 1: fMRI Results


#### Mapwise Analyses

Our first set of analyses identified areas generally engaged during WM maintenance, regardless of subsequent LTM performance. Based on the idea that processing might differ between early and late stages of WM maintenance (Johnson, Reeder, et al., 2002; Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984b), separate regressors modeled activity changes during the early and late stages of the memory delay (see Methods and Figure 7). As shown in Figure 2A, a vast network of cortical regions exhibited sustained activity increases during the early and late delay phases of the task. During the early delay period, activation was observed in bilateral superior parietal gyrus, left gyrus rectus (orbital PFC), left inferior temporal gyrus, and the left inferior occipital gyrus. In



**Figure 1.** Task design in Experiments 1 and 2. (A) Schematic depiction of the delayed recognition task used to elicit neural correlates of WM maintenance in Experiment 1. (B) Schematic depiction of the interference paradigm used to investigate the functional relationship between WM maintenance and LTM formation in Experiment 2.

**Figure 2.** Cortical and medial temporal activation related to WM maintenance and LTM formation. (A) Areas exhibiting overall activation changes during the early (top) and late (bottom) delay periods relative to the ITI. (B) Areas where activation during the early (top) and late (bottom) delay periods was significantly greater for subsequently remembered than for subsequently forgotten objects. Red boxes highlight regions in the left middle frontal gyrus and the left hippocampus where activity during the early delay period was predictive of subsequent LTM.




addition to these neocortical areas, the right hippocampus was recruited during the early delay period. These results replicate our previous findings showing hippocampal activation during WM tasks with novel stimuli (Ranganath & D'Esposito, 2001). During the late delay period, activation was observed in bilateral presupplementary motor area, frontal eye fields, dorsal cingulate, lingual, middle and superior occipital gyri, insula, and left middle temporal gyrus. In addition, bilateral regions in the inferior and middle frontal gyri and intraparietal sulcus were active during both the early and late stages of the memory delay. The topography of cortical regions showing delay-period activity corresponded well with regions identified in previous studies of visual WM maintenance (Curtis, Rao, & D'Esposito, 2004; Ranganath, Cohen, Dam, & D'Esposito, 2004; Linden et al., 2003; Munk et al., 2002; Pessoa, Gutierrez, Bandettini, & Ungerleider, 2002; Postle & D'Esposito, 1999; Courtney, Ungerleider, Keil, & Haxby, 1997). Example time courses of regions showing activation changes during the early or late delay relative to the intertrial interval (ITI) are shown in Figure 3. With the exception of the hippocampus, most areas identified in these contrasts responded robustly during each task phase (cue, early delay, late delay, and probe) for both remembered and forgotten items. Collectively, the results described above confirm that we were able to reliably identify areas that showed activity related to WM maintenance processes.

The next set of analyses identified areas where activity during different stages of the WM task was related to successful LTM formation. In these analyses, we identified regions where activity during the cue, early delay, or late delay periods on WM trials was greater for items that were subsequently remembered (endorsed with a "1" or "2" on the post-scan recognition confidence test) than for trials with novel items that were subsequently

forgotten (endorsed with a "5" or "6" on the postscan test). As in previous studies of LTM formation (Otten et al., 2001; Brewer et al., 1998; Wagner et al., 1998), we excluded items with midrange confidence ratings of 3 and 4 from these analyses in order to maximize our sensitivity to detect subsequent memory effects. By these criteria, the mean numbers of subsequently remembered and forgotten trials included in this contrast was trials were 29.07 ( $SD = 13.01$ ) and 13.73 ( $SD = 8.40$ ), respectively.

Regions exhibiting subsequent memory effects (i.e., significantly greater activation for items that were subsequently remembered than for items that were subsequently forgotten) during the cue, early delay, and late delay phases and example time courses for some of these regions are summarized in Table 1. Areas that exhibited enhanced activity for subsequently remembered items during the cue phase included the ventrolateral prefrontal (at or near Brodmann's area [BA] 44 and 45), orbital (BA 11) prefrontal, parahippocampal (BA 27), perirhinal (BA 36), and fusiform (BA 37) regions that have been identified in numerous previous studies of memory encoding (Davachi, Mitchell, et al., 2003; Ranganath, Yonelinas, et al., 2003; Davachi, Maril, & Wagner, 2001; Otten et al., 2001; Frey & Petrides, 2000, 2002; Brewer et al., 1998; Wagner et al., 1998). Transient increases in activity in each of these regions during initial processing of the cue stimulus influenced successful LTM formation.

Independent of the transient, stimulus-related effects described above, our experimental design allowed us to identify areas where activity during the early and late stages of WM maintenance was related to successful LTM formation. We specifically hypothesized that areas within the PFC and MTL would show subsequent memory effects during the delay period. Consistent with this



**Figure 3.** Temporal dynamics of activity related to WM maintenance. The time course of activity is shown for regions that exhibited increased activity during the early (A) and late (B) delay periods of each WM trial. Because the length of the memory delay varied from trial to trial, trial-averaged time courses were constructed by first realigning the time series for each trial separately to the onset of each cue and probe object. Each graph therefore shows percent signal change (x-axis) relative to trial onset as a function of time following cue or probe presentation. Early delay period activation in the right hippocampus (upper left) appeared to be driven entirely by subsequently remembered items and specific to the early delay period. However, activation in the ventrolateral PFC, intraparietal sulcus, and medial occipital cortex (as with other areas that exhibited overall increases in delay activity) was observed during each trial period and was similar for both remembered and forgotten trials.

prediction, activity in the left dorsolateral PFC (BA 9) and the left anterior hippocampus during the early delay period was enhanced for items that were subsequently remembered relative to items that were subsequently forgotten (Figures 2B and 4). In addition, visual, pre-motor, and motor areas were also identified in this contrast. During the late delay period, subsequent memory effects were primarily evident in posterior parietal and occipital cortical areas such as the intraparietal sulcus (BA 7/40), and the middle occipital gyrus (BA 18), as well as in the precentral gyrus (BA 6). The overall pattern of results suggests an anterior-to-posterior shift in subsequent memory effects observed between the early and late phases of the memory delay.

The results described above suggested that PFC and MTL activity during the early delay mediated interactions between WM maintenance and LTM formation. Given our a priori hypotheses regarding the PFC and MTL, we ran additional analyses to determine whether the magnitude of subsequent memory effects within the dorsolateral PFC and hippocampus was correlated with individual differences in memory performance (i.e., high confidence hit – false alarm rates). As shown in Figure 5,

we found that, within the hippocampus, the magnitude of the subsequent memory effect during the early delay period was significantly correlated with memory performance ( $r = .54, p < .05$ ). These results suggest that hippocampal activity during the initial stage of WM maintenance was linked to successful LTM formation both within and across subjects.

## Experiment 2

We interpreted the results of Experiment 1 as evidence that processing within the hippocampus and dorsolateral PFC during the initial stage of WM maintenance functionally contributed to successful LTM formation. Based on these results, we predicted that interfering with processing early in the memory delay should impair LTM formation. We tested this prediction in Experiment 2. As shown in Figure 1B, this behavioral study was similar to Experiment 1, except that, while performing the WM task, subjects were additionally instructed to perform a secondary task. Specifically, they were informed that, on most trials, an array of lines would be shown during the memory delay. When this happened,

**Table 1.** Local Maxima of Regions Exhibiting Subsequent LTM Effects during Cue or Delay Phases of Delayed Recognition Trials

| <i>Region</i>   | <i>BA</i> | <i>x</i> | <i>y</i> | <i>z</i> | <i>k</i> | <i>t(14)</i> |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| <i>Cue Period</i>                                       |           |          |          |          |          |              |
| R. Fusiform Gyrus                                       | 37        | 46       | −49      | −18      | 83       | 6.32         |
| R. Middle Occipital Gyrus                               | 19/37     | 32       | −60      | −7       |          | 5.48         |
| R. Fusiform Gyrus                                       | 37        | 35       | −46      | −18      |          | 5.20         |
| R. Thalamus   |           | 21       | −24      | 0        | 8        | 6.30         |
| R. Posterior Inferior Frontal Gyrus                     | 44        | 46       | 7        | 32       | 35       | 5.87         |
| R. Inferior Frontal Gyrus, Pars Triangularis            | 45        | 52       | 32       | 18       | 17       | 5.69         |
| L. Inferior Frontal Gyrus, Pars Triangularis            | 45        | −32      | 32       | 4        | 26       | 5.62         |
| L. Gyrus Rectus   | 11        | −24      | 35       | −14      |          | 5.29         |
| R. Gyrus Rectus   | 11        | 21       | 49       | −18      | 14       | 5.52         |
| L. Middle Occipital Gyrus                               | 19/37     | −24      | −74      | −10      | 85       | 5.10         |
| L. Fusiform Gyrus                                       | 18        | −38      | −80      | −14      |          | 5.00         |
| L. Lingual Gyrus  | 19        | −24      | −66      | 0        |          | 5.00         |
| R. Cuneus   | 17        | 14       | −80      | 10       | 33       | 5.06         |
| R. Middle Occipital Gyrus                               | 19        | 46       | −77      | 10       |          | 4.17         |
| R. Middle Occipital Gyrus                               | 39        | 42       | −77      | 21       | 8        | 5.06         |
| R. Middle Occipital Gyrus                               | 18        | 28       | −91      | 14       | 31       | 5.05         |
| L. Posterior Collateral Sulcus (Parahippocampal Cortex) | 37        | −28      | −42      | −14      | 8        | 4.91         |
| L. Middle Frontal Gyrus                                 | 9         | −49      | 35       | 28       | 9        | 4.87         |
| R. Inferior Temporal Gyrus                              | 21        | 46       | −60      | 0        | 7        | 4.82         |
| L. Anterior Collateral Sulcus (Perirhinal Cortex)       | 36        | −32      | −21      | −32      | 14       | 4.75         |
| L. Anterior Collateral Sulcus (Perirhinal Cortex)       | 36        | −32      | −10      | −35      |          | 4.70         |
| L. Anterior Collateral Sulcus (Perirhinal Cortex)       | 36        | −28      | −14      | −28      |          | 4.46         |
| L. Intraparietal Sulcus                                 | 40        | −32      | −46      | 46       | 6        | 4.62         |
| R. Inferior Occipital Gyrus                             | 18        | 35       | −77      | −7       | 12       | 4.45         |
| R. Inferior Occipital Gyrus                             | 18        | 28       | −84      | −7       |          | 4.44         |
| <i>Early Delay Period</i>                               |           |          |          |          |          |              |
| R. Superior Occipital Gyrus                             | 18        | 14       | −98      | 14       | 28       | 6.95         |
| R. Supplementary Motor Area                             | 6         | 0        | −4       | 56       | 22       | 6.55         |
| L. Paracentral Lobule                                   | 6         | −18      | −28      | 66       | 24       | 6.21         |
| L. Paracentral Lobule                                   | 5         | −10      | −42      | 67       |          | 4.51         |
| L. Central Sulcus                                       | 4         | −46      | −18      | 46       | 9        | 6.16         |
| L. Middle Frontal Gyrus                                 | 9         | −32      | 46       | 35       | 10       | 5.51         |
| R. Central Sulcus                                       | 2         | 28       | −38      | 63       | 28       | 5.48         |
| R. Central Sulcus                                       | 3         | 32       | −35      | 56       |          | 4.86         |
| R. Central Sulcus                                       | 4         | 24       | −28      | 66       |          | 4.83         |
| L. Anterior Hippocampus                                 |           | −24      | −14      | −14      | 9        | 5.44         |
| R. Cingulate Gyrus                                      | 24        | 14       | −4       | 46       | 7        | 5.35         |



**Table 1.** (*continued*)

| <i>Region</i>             | <i>BA</i> | <i>x</i> | <i>y</i> | <i>z</i> | <i>k</i> | <i>t(14)</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| L. Insula                 |           | −32      | 10       | 7        | 7        | 5.01         |
| R. Cuneus                 | 17        | 0        | −84      | 7        | 11       | 4.93         |
| L. Cerebellum             |           | −18      | −52      | −24      | 12       | 4.72         |
| <i>Late Delay Period</i>  |           |          |          |          |          |              |
| R. Middle Occipital Gyrus | 18        | 24       | −94      | 10       | 21       | 5.72         |
| R. Lingual Gyrus          | 18        | 21       | −88      | −4       |          | 4.67         |
| R. Supramarginal Gyrus    | 40        | 42       | −35      | 38       | 6        | 5.03         |
| L. Precentral Gyrus       | 4         | −56      | −14      | 52       | 9        | 5.02         |
| R. Intraparietal Sulcus   | 7/40      | 32       | −56      | 56       | 7        | 4.71         |

Abbreviations: R = right; L = left; BA = Brodmann's area; *k* = cluster size.

subjects were instructed to verbally indicate the number of lines shown in the array. The onset of the interference array was varied such that it was presented either early (1 sec), in the middle (4 sec), or late (7 sec) in the memory delay. On the remaining trials, no distracter was presented during the delay. After the WM task was completed, subjects were given a surprise LTM test on the previously rehearsed objects. With this design, we were able to analyze subsequent LTM performance as a function of the presence and temporal onset of interference with WM processing. The early delay interference probe was presented precisely at the time when we would expect subjects to be actively constructing internal representations of each object in WM (Jiang, 2004).<sup>2</sup> We therefore hypothesized that interference during the early stage of WM maintenance (i.e., early in the memory delay) should impair subsequent LTM performance.

We first examined the relationship between the timing of the distracter array and RT and accuracy on the match/nonmatch decision of each WM trial. Mean accuracy and RTs for each condition are shown in Table 2. Analyses of these data indicated that the timing of the interference probe did not significantly affect accuracy [ $F(3,45) = 1.33, p > .20$ ], but did affect RTs [ $F(3,45) = 8.20, p < .001$ ] on the match/nonmatch decision. Follow-up analyses showed that RTs were slower on late delay distracter and no-distracter trials than early delay or mid-delay distracter trials [all  $ts(15) > 2.9$ , all  $ps < .05$ ]. These findings would suggest that there was no systematic relationship between the timing of the interference array and performance on the WM decision.

The next set of analyses concerned the critical question of whether there was a relationship between the timing of the distracter probe and performance on the subsequent LTM test. Results showed that the timing of the distracter probe significantly affected subsequent recognition performance [ $F(3,45) = 4.71, p < .01$ ]. As


shown in Figure 6, LTM performance was significantly worse for items encountered on trials when the distracter array was presented early in the rehearsal period than for items encountered on trials when the distracter array was presented at other times or when no distracter was presented at all [all  $ts(15) > 2.7$ , all  $ps < .05$ ]. Subsequent LTM performance for items encountered on trials when the distracter was presented in the middle of or late in the delay did not significantly differ, nor did LTM performance in these conditions differ from LTM performance for items encountered on no-distracter trials (all  $ts < 1$ ). Collectively, these findings suggest that interfering with processing early in the delay period significantly and disproportionately impaired subsequent LTM performance, whereas interfering with processing later in the delay had no observable effect on subsequent LTM.

## DISCUSSION

In the present study, we sought to characterize the relationship between different stages of WM maintenance and LTM formation. Results of Experiment 1 showed that activity in the dorsolateral PFC, hippocampus, and other regions during the early stage of WM maintenance was predictive of subsequent LTM. Results of Experiment 2 showed that processing during the early stage of WM maintenance disproportionately influenced LTM formation over and above processing implemented during the cue period or processing later in the memory delay.

### Prefrontal Contributions to WM Maintenance and LTM Formation


Results from neuropsychological studies suggest that damage to the PFC can disrupt performance on WM and LTM tasks that demand executive control (Ranganath



**Figure 4.** Neural activity during WM maintenance that was predictive of subsequent LTM. Data are shown for regions in (A) the left dorsolateral PFC (BA 9) and (B) in the left hippocampus that showed subsequent memory effects during the early delay period, and (C) for a region in the right occipital cortex (BA 18) that showed a subsequent memory effect during the late delay. Left: Parameter estimates indexing estimated response amplitudes during the cue, early delay, and late delay phases of WM trials are plotted for each of region. Center: Trial-averaged time courses are plotted for subsequently remembered and forgotten items. Right: The time course of the difference in activity between subsequently remembered and forgotten items.

& Knight, 2003; Shimamura, 2000; D'Esposito & Postle, 1999). Within the PFC, results from previous neuroimaging studies would suggest that ventrolateral subregions (BA 44, 45, and 47) should have been the most likely sites of interaction between WM maintenance and LTM encoding processes—ventrolateral PFC activation is routinely reported in studies of WM maintenance (Ranganath, Cohen, et al., 2004; Ranganath, Johnson, & D'Esposito, 2003; Pessoa et al., 2002; Postle & D'Esposito, 1999; Courtney et al., 1997) and LTM formation (Davachi, Mitchell, et al., 2003; Ranganath, Yonelinas, et al., 2003; Otten et al., 2001; Henson et al., 1999; Brewer et al., 1998; Wagner et al., 1998). These findings have prompted many researchers to suggest that ventrolateral prefrontal regions may promote successful LTM formation through their roles in WM


processes that bias the selection and maintenance of relevant item features (Buckner, 2003; Ranganath & Knight, 2003; Fernandez & Tendolkar, 2001; Wagner, 1999). Our results were partly consistent with this view, in that the ventrolateral PFC (BA 44, 45, and 47) exhibited sustained activity when subjects were engaged in active WM maintenance (Figure 2), and that activity in some of these regions (BA 44 and 45) was predictive of subsequent LTM performance (Table 1). However, the magnitude of ventrolateral PFC activity was specifically related to subsequent LTM performance during initial processing of each object (i.e., during the cue period), rather than during WM maintenance. A similar pattern of results was observed in the orbital PFC (BA 11), another PFC subregion implicated in LTM formation (Ranganath, Yonelinas, et al., 2003; Frey & Petrides, 2000, 2002). Thus,



**Figure 5.** Hippocampal recruitment during the early delay predicted individual differences in memory performance. A scatterplot shows the relationship between subsequent memory effects (i.e., the difference in early delay parameter estimates between subsequently remembered and subsequently forgotten trials) observed in the left hippocampus and performance on the LTM test (i.e., the difference between the proportion of high confidence hits and high confidence false alarms). These data demonstrate that hippocampal activity during the initial stage of WM maintenance was strongly predictive of successful LTM formation both within and across subjects.

the ventrolateral and orbital PFC might initially focus processing of items in a manner that enhances the distinctiveness or strength of a memory trace, but further activity in these regions during WM maintenance does not necessarily result in substantial LTM enhancement.

In contrast to ventrolateral PFC activation, dorsolateral PFC activation has been observed only infrequently in event-related fMRI studies of LTM encoding (Savage et al., 2001; Fletcher, Shallice, & Dolan, 1998). Three studies have even reported *decreases* in dorsolateral PFC activation for remembered items (Dasselar, Prince, & Cabeza, 2004; Otten & Rugg, 2001; Wagner & Davachi, 2001). The lack of extensive dorsolateral PFC activation in previous neuroimaging studies is surprising, given that evidence from lesion (Duarte, Ranganath, & Knight, 2004; Gershberg & Shimamura, 1995) and transcranial magnetic stimulation (Kohler, Paus, Buckner, & Milner, 2004; Rami et al., 2003; Sandrini, Cappa, Rossi, Rossini, &



**Figure 6.** Interfering with the early stage of WM maintenance significantly and disproportionately impaired LTM formation. Results from Experiment 2 are plotted, showing the proportion of objects subsequently recognized with high confidence as a function of the latency of presentation of the distracter array. Subsequent LTM was significantly worse on trials when the interference array was presented early in the memory delay relative to other trial types, which did not differ from one another.

\*Represents substandard conditions during the experiment.

Miniussi, 2003; Epstein, Sekino, Yamaguchi, Kamiya, & Ueno, 2002; Rossi et al., 2001) studies suggest a potentially important role for this region in promoting LTM formation. However, except for one study (Davachi, Maril, et al., 2001), previous neuroimaging studies of LTM formation have not required active WM maintenance. Our results suggest that the dorsolateral PFC (BA 9) was recruited during the initial stage of WM maintenance (Figure 4). This finding is consistent with results from a single-unit recording study in which the temporal characteristics of dorsolateral PFC activity were examined during a spatial WM task (Kojima & Goldman-Rakic, 1982). Critically, these investigators found that over half of the neurons that exhibited persistent delay-period activity exhibited maximal activity during the initial few seconds of the delay period.

Our results also converge with an emerging pattern in neuroimaging studies of WM. For example, Johnson, Mitchell, et al. (2004), Johnson, Raye, et al. (2003), and Raye et al. (2002) have observed reliable increases in dorsolateral PFC (left BA 9) activation when subjects attempted to “refresh” a recently activated representa-

**Table 2.** Mean Accuracy and Reaction Time (RT) for WM decisions in Experiment 2

|           | Latency of Interference |                |                |                 |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
|           | Early                   | Middle         | Late           | No Interference |
| Accuracy  | 0.902 (0.108)           | 0.928 (0.079)  | 0.944 (0.047)  | 0.949 (0.072)   |
| RT (msec) | 879.9 (252.83)          | 860.8 (187.70) | 971.5 (188.58) | 1022.8 (276.22) |

Note: SD values are in parentheses.



tion. In a similar vein, Bor, Cumming, Scott, and Owen (2004) and Bor, Duncan, Wiseman, and Owen (2003) reported increased dorsolateral PFC activation during WM tasks in which sequences of digits or locations could be “chunked” relative to tasks in which sequences of digits or locations were unstructured and hence difficult to chunk. Finally, Prabhakaran, Narayanan, Zhao, and Gabrieli (2000) reported enhanced dorsolateral PFC activation during a task that required subjects to bind different kinds of information in WM. Collectively, each of these results suggest that the dorsolateral PFC plays an important and previously underappreciated role in processing during the initial stage of WM maintenance, which in turn contributes to successful LTM formation (see below).

### **MTL Contributions to WM Maintenance and LTM Formation**

Although the hippocampus, parahippocampal cortex, and perirhinal cortex are traditionally thought to contribute solely to LTM, substantial evidence suggests that these regions may contribute to both WM and LTM. For example, lesion studies in humans and monkeys suggest that large MTL lesions that include the perirhinal cortex have devastating effects on memory for novel visual objects, even across short delays spanning a few seconds (Buffalo, Reber, & Squire, 1998; Owen, Sahakian, Semple, Polkey, & Robbins, 1995; Eacott, Gaffan, & Murray, 1994; Suzuki, Zola-Morgan, Squire, & Amaral, 1993; Murray & Mishkin, 1986; Zola-Morgan & Squire, 1985). Furthermore, neurophysiological studies have found robust correlates of WM maintenance within the entorhinal and perirhinal cortices (Egorov, Hamam, Franssen, Hasselmo, & Alonso, 2002; Suzuki, Miller, & Desimone, 1997; Nakamura & Kubota, 1995, 1996; Miyashita & Chang, 1988), and several recent fMRI studies have reported hippocampal activity associated with WM for novel stimuli (Park et al., 2003; Cabeza, Dolcos, Graham, & Nyberg, 2002; Davachi & Wagner, 2002; Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001; Stern et al., 2001).

In the present study, we found that recruitment of the anterior hippocampus during the initial stage of WM maintenance was directly related to successful LTM formation. The prolonged latency (during the early delay period) and sustained time course of this activity (Figure 4B) was qualitatively different from those of hemodynamic responses reported in studies of LTM formation that did not require active maintenance (Reber et al., 2002; Kirchoff, Wagner, Maril, & Stern, 2000). These findings suggest that the hippocampus is a key site for interactions between WM and LTM.

One might argue that delay-period activity in the hippocampus might reflect incidental processing that was not related to WM maintenance. For example, during the delay period, subjects might have attempted to compare active information in WM to recently formed

LTM representations, which in turn might have driven hippocampal activity for remembered items. However, results from Experiment 2 showed that disrupting processing during the initial portion of the memory delay impaired LTM. If hippocampal activity solely reflected a comparison between information in WM and LTM, it is unclear why interfering with this process would result in impaired LTM. More generally, available evidence suggests that when subjects are required to actively maintain complex, novel information, hippocampal activity increases well beyond levels seen in tasks that simply involve intentional encoding of these items. For example, in a previous study (Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001), we found that the anterior hippocampus exhibited robust delay-period activity in a WM task using novel face stimuli, but the same region exhibited no reliable signal changes during a task that required intentional encoding of faces in anticipation of a subsequent LTM test (Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001). This pattern of results suggests that the demand to actively maintain a complex, novel stimulus results in significantly increased hippocampal recruitment above and beyond activity that is elicited by initial stimulus encoding.

The results of the present study complement our previous results (Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001) by demonstrating that hippocampal activity during WM maintenance is correlated with successful LTM formation. This correlation could be interpreted in at least two ways. **One possible explanation is that, during the early delay period, subjects’ attempts to construct an internal representation of each object resulted in additional input to the hippocampus, which resulted in increased activity for items that were successfully encoded into LTM.** By this view, hippocampal activity in this and other studies of WM for novel items (Park et al., 2003; Davachi & Wagner, 2002; Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001; Stern et al., 2001) reflects the incidental enhancement of LTM encoding produced by WM maintenance, rather than direct involvement of this region in WM processes. An alternate way of explaining the same finding is that the hippocampus contributes to WM maintenance by virtue of its role in LTM (Ranganath & D’Esposito, 2001). Specifically, we suggest that novel object representations were initially encoded in the MTL, and that these representations were used to reconstruct and maintain the pattern of activity corresponding to these objects in posterior cortical areas later in the delay. By this view, the hippocampus plays a critical role in LTM formation, and sustained activation of these new LTM traces additionally facilitates reconstruction of complex, novel information in WM. Distinguishing between these views will be difficult, but future studies could address this issue through careful examination of WM in patients with focal MTL damage (Hannula, Cohen, & Tranel, 2003). In addition, event-related analyses of functional connectivity (Rissman, Gazzaley, & D’Esposito, 2004) between MTL and posterior cortical regions during the

performance of WM tasks can provide another source of evidence to determine whether, as we suggest, the hippocampus plays a role in dynamic reconstruction of complex, novel information in WM.

### **Subsequent Memory Effects in Posterior Cortical Areas**

Although our *a priori* hypotheses concerned PFC and MTL regions, we noted that several posterior cortical areas also exhibited large and reliable subsequent memory effects during the memory delay. Some of these effects, such as those observed in motor cortical areas, are difficult to interpret, but might merit additional consideration, given that they have been observed in some other studies of LTM encoding (e.g., Ranganath, Yonelinas, et al., 2003; Buckner, Wheeler, & Sheridan, 2001; Otten et al., 2001). One somewhat surprising finding was that extensive regions of the occipital cortex exhibited persistent activity increases during the memory delay, and that this activity was correlated with successful LTM formation during both the early and late delay periods. This pattern of results suggests that visual WM maintenance and its effects on LTM formation might be mediated in part through persistent activity in the early visual cortex (Gisiger, Kerszberg, & Changeux, 2004; Hebb, 1949). Interestingly, this interpretation is consistent with the fact that our visual distracter in Experiment 2 impaired LTM formation. Future work would be necessary to confirm that such distraction effects are specific to visual stimuli, as we might expect if plasticity in visual cortex contributed to object LTM formation.

### **Functional Relationship between WM Maintenance and LTM Formation**

As noted earlier, the relationship between WM maintenance and LTM formation has been an issue of considerable debate. Although it is clear that processing that emphasizes formation of associations across multiple items (“elaborative rehearsal”) strongly influences LTM formation ( Craik, 2002; Hunt & Einstein, 1981; Craik & Lockhart, 1972), the role of WM maintenance in new LTM formation has been strongly disputed. Much of the dispute in the literature has been over whether there is a continuous relationship between the amount of uninterrupted rehearsal time and subsequent LTM performance. Results from Experiments 1 and 2 address this issue by demonstrating that there is a relationship between WM and LTM, but that this relationship is clearly not linear. In Experiment 1, we found no significant relationship between the length of the delay on WM trials and subsequent LTM performance. Furthermore, results from Experiment 2 showed that LTM performance was impaired when an interference array

was presented early in the delay, but not if it was presented in the middle or the late phases of the memory delay (Figure 6). These data suggest a real link between WM processing and LTM formation, but they are also inconsistent with the idea that more time spent engaging in WM maintenance simply results in better memory.

One might question whether the results that we obtained might be peculiar to the complex visual stimuli used in this experiment. Indeed, it is possible that the novelty and complexity of these objects necessitated specific processing during WM maintenance that might not be necessary for rehearsing simple, overlearned information. Relevant to this question, two studies (Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984a, 1984b) showed that increasing the number of times a word was rehearsed from 1 to 4 or 5 times significantly increased the likelihood that it would be subsequently remembered, but further increasing the number of rehearsals to 10 did not result in additional improvements in subsequent LTM performance. These findings suggest that, to some degree, the type of nonlinear relationship between WM processing and LTM formation observed here might apply even in the case of simple overlearned stimuli such as verbal material.

The present behavioral and imaging results are open to at least two interpretations that can be tested in future studies. Our interpretation is that, under at least some circumstances, processing qualitatively differs between the early and late stages of WM maintenance, and that early WM maintenance processes disproportionately contribute to LTM formation. An alternate explanation is that WM maintenance is more or less a unitary process, but for reasons that are presently unclear, only the initial few seconds of maintenance processing actually contribute to LTM formation. If, as we and others have suggested, early WM processing is relatively effortful and late WM processing is relatively automatic, then these two explanations could be contrasted in behavioral studies using methods to characterize the degree to which controlled processing is engaged during different stages of WM maintenance. This issue was examined in studies of verbal WM by Naveh-Benjamin and Jonides (1984b), who showed in three experiments that the first four rehearsals of a word engaged much more controlled processing than subsequent rehearsals. These results suggest that, at least under some circumstances, processing during early and late stages of WM maintenance can be qualitatively distinguished. Further work examining the temporal dynamics of controlled processing during WM maintenance will be necessary to examine the generalizability of their findings across other stimuli and task situations.

Finally, we note that an interesting aspect of the present results is that, although presentation of an interference probe during the early delay disrupted subsequent LTM performance, it had no reliable effect on WM task performance (Table 2). Nonetheless, this

should not be taken to suggest that the distracter task did not have any effect on WM processing. Indeed, it is likely that the interference manipulation affected the ability to form and maintain holistic, detailed object representations but did not affect maintenance of low-level visual features (e.g., a triangle on the lower right corner of the object). Whereas maintenance of low-level featural representations might be sufficient to make a WM decision, overlap of these features across successive objects would make them insufficient to support accurate LTM performance. Accordingly, it is reasonable to suggest that our interference manipulation affected the overall quality of the WM representation, but did not eliminate the ability to maintain features that could be used to make decisions on the WM task.

## Conclusions

By functionally dissociating early and late WM maintenance processing, the present results call into question common assumptions that underlie the overwhelming majority of neuroscientific investigations of WM tasks. For example, most neurophysiological (O'Scalaidhe, Wilson, & Goldman-Rakic, 1997; Suzuki et al., 1997; Nakamura & Kubota, 1995; Miller, Li, & Desimone, 1993; Fuster, 1990; Miyashita & Chang, 1988) and neuroimaging studies of object WM (Ranganath, Cohen, et al., 2004; Ranganath, DeGutis, & D'Esposito, 2004; Ranganath, Johnson, et al., 2003; Linden et al., 2003; Jha & McCarthy, 2000; Courtney et al., 1997) have used delay tasks similar to those used here. In such studies, sustained neural responses observed during the memory delay are typically interpreted to reflect neural correlates of a unitary WM maintenance process (Curtis & D'Esposito, 2003). Our results suggest that, in fact, the processes supporting the early and late stages of WM maintenance might be quite different. More specifically, our results suggest that the early stage of WM maintenance contributes to successful LTM formation, and that this effect is mediated by a network that includes the dorsolateral PFC and the hippocampus.

## METHODS

### Experiment 1

#### *Participants*

Fifteen (8 men; aged 20–28) participants were recruited from the UC Davis student community. Participants gave informed consent prior to the experiment and were paid for their participation.

#### *Behavioral Procedure*

The materials used in this study were line-drawings of novel “possible” objects (see Figure 1) drawn from previous studies (Williams & Tarr, 1997, 1999; Schacter

& Cooper, 1993; Schacter, Cooper, & Valdiserri, 1992; Schacter, Cooper, & Delaney, 1990). Prior to the scanning session, participants were trained to learn eight of these objects (“learned” objects) by performing 48 trials of an immediate match-to-sample task. Participants also performed eight delayed-recognition trials using these stimuli to ensure that they were comfortable with the task.

During the scanning phase, participants first performed a visuomotor response task, the results of which were used to empirically estimate a subject-specific hemodynamic response function (HRF; see below). Next, participants performed 128 trials of a delayed-recognition task. On each trial, a cue object was shown for 1 sec, and subjects were instructed to maintain a vivid mental image of the stimulus across a variable 7–13 sec delay period. Following the delay, a probe object (either a matching or nonmatching object) was shown for 1 sec, and participants pressed one of two buttons on a response box to indicate whether or not the probe matched the cue stimulus. Match/nonmatch decisions were made by pressing one of two buttons on a magnet-compatible response device. A variable 9–15 sec ITI preceded the start of the next trial. Half of the trials contained items seen in the prescan training session (“learned”; 8 presentations of each item) and half contained novel, trial-unique items (i.e., items that were not presented during the prescan training session). There were an equal number of match and nonmatch trials, and all trial types were presented in a pseudorandom order. Results from the trials with learned stimuli will not be discussed here.

Following the scanning session, participants were given a surprise recognition memory test to assess LTM for all of the items that were shown as cue stimuli in the scanner (64 novel and 8 learned plus 37 novel foils). In this test, participants were shown each item individually on a computer screen and were instructed to rate each item on a confidence scale that ranged from 1 (“definitely seen during scanning phase”) to 6 (“definitely NOT seen during scanning phase”). Subjects were instructed to distribute their responses across the entire range of the scale when making their decisions.

#### *MRI Acquisition and Processing*

MRI data were collected on a 1.5-T GE Signa scanner at the UC Davis Research Imaging Center. Functional imaging was done with a gradient-echo echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequence (TR = 2000, TE = 40, FOV = 220, 64 × 64 matrix, voxel size = 3.4375 × 3.4375 × 5 mm), with each volume consisting of 24 axial slices. Co-planar and high-resolution T1-weighted images were also acquired. fMRI data preprocessing was performed with Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM99) software for all subjects. EPI images were sinc interpolated in time to correct for between-slice timing differences in image


acquisition, realigned using a six-parameter, rigid-body transformation algorithm, spatially normalized to the template from the International Consortium for Brain Mapping Project (Cocosco, Kollokian, Kwan, & Evans, 1997), resliced into 3.5-mm isotropic voxels, and spatially smoothed with an 8-mm FWHM Gaussian filter.

### MRI Data Analysis

Activity changes during each phase of each trial were deconvolved using multiple regression (Curtis et al., 2004; Ranganath, Cohen, et al., 2004; Munk et al., 2002; Sakai, Rowe, & Passingham, 2002; Ranganath & D'Esposito, 2001; Postle, Zarahn, & D'Esposito, 2000; Rowe, Toni, Josephs, Frackowiak, & Passingham, 2000; Courtney et al., 1997; Zarahn, Aguirre, & D'Esposito, 1997). The basic assumption behind this approach is that the time course of BOLD signal changes on any given WM trial can be considered as distinct patterns of neural activity that are convolved with the HRF. Covariates modeling BOLD signal changes associated with the cue, early delay, late delay, and probe periods of each trial were constructed by convolving vectors of expected neural activity associated with each of these components with a subject-specific HRF estimated from responses in the central sulcus during the visuomotor response task (Handwerker, Ollinger, & D'Esposito, 2004; Ranganath, Cohen, et al., 2004; Aguirre, Zarahn, & D'Esposito, 1998). Data from the visuomotor response task were not available for one subject, and for this subject, covariates were constructed by convolving the vector of expected neural activity with the "canonical" HRF included in SPM99.

The vectors of expected neural activity associated with each task component for trials of different delay lengths are shown in Figure 7. The construction of the early and late delay covariates was based on the assumption that processing associated with the initial stage of WM maintenance would occur during the first few seconds of the delay, regardless of the overall delay length. In contrast, we assumed that processing associated with the second stage of WM maintenance would persist throughout the remainder of the memory delay (see Jiang, 2004, for theoretical justification for these assumptions; Raye et al., 2002; Naveh-Benjamin & Jonides, 1984a, 1984b).

As shown in Figure 7, the onset and offset of delay-period vectors were spaced apart from the cue and probe period vectors so as to minimize the possibility that neural activity limited to the cue and probe periods would load on the early or late delay covariates (Ranganath & D'Esposito, 2001; Postle et al., 2000; Zarahn et al., 1997). Because the length of the delay period varied from trial to trial, our design allowed us to effectively deconvolve late delay responses from early delay and probe responses (Sakai & Passingham, 2003; Sakai et al., 2002; Rowe et al., 2000). Inspection of ob-



**Figure 7.** Vectors of expected neural activity corresponding to cue, early delay, late delay, and probe phases are shown separately for trials of different delay lengths (7–13 sec). Covariates modeling BOLD responses on each WM trial were constructed by convolving these neural activity vectors with subject-specific HRFs.

served activity time courses (see Figure 4) suggests that the model estimates accurately characterized the data.

Responses during each task phase were modeled separately for trials with learned stimuli, trials with novel

stimuli that were subsequently remembered with high confidence (items that were endorsed with a “1” or “2” confidence rating on the postscan LTM test), trials with novel stimuli that were subsequently recognized with low confidence (items that were endorsed with a “3” or “4” confidence rating), and trials with stimuli that were subsequently forgotten (novel items that were endorsed with a “5” or “6” on the postscan LTM test). These covariates only modeled responses for trials that were associated with correct match/nonmatch decisions on the WM probe. Trials associated with incorrect WM decisions were modeled with separate covariates. Additional nuisance covariates modeled global signal changes that could not be accounted for by variables in the design matrix (Desjardins, Kiehl, & Liddle, 2001), trial-specific baseline shifts, and an intercept. The convolution matrix included a time-domain representation of the  $1/f$  power structure (Aguirre et al., 1998; Zarahn et al., 1997) and filters to remove frequencies above 0.25 Hz and below 0.02 Hz.

Following single-subject analyses, images of parameter estimates for each contrast of interest (i.e., linear combinations of regression coefficients from the GLM) were entered into a second-level one-sample  $t$  test, in which the mean estimate across participants at each voxel was tested against zero. Significant regions of activation were identified using an uncorrected two-tailed threshold of  $p < .001$  and a minimum cluster size of at least 6 contiguous voxels. For visualization purposes, thresholded statistical parametric maps were overlaid on T1-weighted images using MRIcro software (Rorden & Brett, 2000). Further analyses were performed on regions of interest, which were defined by selecting all contiguous, significantly active voxels in anatomically constrained areas at a two-tailed threshold of  $p < .001$ .

## Experiment 2

The materials and methods used in this behavior-only experiment were similar to Experiment 1, but with the following modifications. As shown in Figure 1B, subjects performed a delayed recognition task in which a cue object was presented for 1 sec, followed by a 9-sec delay, followed by a probe object for 1 sec. Subjects were instructed to maintain a vivid mental image of each object during the delay in anticipation of the upcoming test probe. On 75% of the trials, an array of overlapping lines (3, 4, or 5 lines in one of three different configurations) was briefly presented for 1 sec at some point during the delay. When an array was presented, subjects were instructed to verbally report the number of lines in the interference array, and these responses were recorded by an experimenter. Across trials, the onset latency of the interference array was varied such that it was equally likely to appear early (1 sec), in the middle

(4 sec), or late (7 sec) in the delay period. On the remaining 25% of the trials, no interference was presented.

Following completion of 60 WM trials, subjects were given a surprise LTM test with 60 real items and 60 foil objects. As in Experiment 1, subjects made recognition confidence judgments on a 1–6 scale, and the dependent measure was the proportion of trials recognized with high confidence (“1” or “2” responses). In this experiment, analyses of the relation between the timing of the interference probe and subsequent LTM performance only included trials with nonmatching probes that were associated with correct WM decisions. Trials with matching probes were not included in subsequent memory analyses, because on these trials, processing of the matching probe stimulus would defeat the purpose of interfering with WM maintenance (i.e., processing the probe stimulus would allow subjects to refresh a mental representation of the cue stimulus). Nonetheless, the reported pattern of results was unchanged if results from match and nonmatch trials were included in this analysis.

## Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NINDS grant PO1 NS40813, a grant from the Institute for Research on Pathological Gambling and Related Disorders, and by grants from the UC Davis Academic Senate and Alzheimer’s Disease Center. We thank Silvia Bunge, Marvin Chun, and Brad Postle for helpful comments and Aaron Heller, Steve Luck, and two anonymous reviewers for constructive criticism on a previous version of this manuscript.

Reprint requests should be sent to Charan Ranganath, Center for Neuroscience, 1544 Newton Ct., University of California, Davis, CA 95616, or via e-mail: cranganath@ucdavis.edu, www.dynamicmemorylab.org.

The data reported in this experiment have been deposited with the fMRI Data Center archive (www.fmridc.org). The accession number is 2-2004-1187K.

## Notes

1. We note that these processes (particularly short-term consolidation) are sometimes described as WM “encoding” processes, particularly in studies with simple overlearned verbal or spatial stimuli, where initial WM processing can be rapid and transient (Vogel & Luck, 2002; Jolicoeur & Dell’Acqua, 1998). The use of the term “encoding” in this context refers to the processing of an item such that it can be actively maintained. In our experiment, it is likely that subjects’ attempts to construct an internal representation of each object extended several seconds into the memory delay, and therefore this processing would be more aptly described as a stage of maintenance, rather than encoding. Our terminology has the added advantage of clearly distinguishing WM-related processing from other types of stimulus-driven perceptual processing that are sometimes described by the term “encoding.”
2. It could be argued that the operationalization of “early delay” differed between Experiments 1 and 2. The onset of the covariate modeling early delay activity in Experiment 1 was



timed 2 sec after the onset of the memory delay. In contrast, the onset of the early delay interference probe in Experiment 2 was timed 1 sec after the onset of the memory delay. Available evidence from behavioral studies suggests that initial WM maintenance processing probably occurs soon after initial processing of the cue item and that it could persist at least 1–3 sec into the memory delay. After that, we would expect maintenance-related activity to be well established in the posterior cortex and require much less top-down input. This is why, in Experiment 2, we targeted 1 sec as the “early delay” period to interfere with. In Experiment 1, however, we faced a problem inherent in fMRI—the sluggishness of the BOLD response makes it difficult to deconvolve sequential neural events that occur close together in time. We therefore timed the onset of the early delay covariate to best model activity specific to the initial stage of WM maintenance. It is possible that the early delay covariate might have underestimated the number of brain regions mediating the relationship between initial WM maintenance and successful LTM formation. However, this concern does not affect interpretation of the significant results related to the early delay covariate.

## REFERENCES

- Aguirre, G. K., Zarahn, E., & D'Esposito, M. (1998). The variability of human, BOLD hemodynamic responses. *Neuroimage*, 8, 360–369.
- Atkinson, R., & Shiffrin, R. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. Spence & J. Spence (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–105). New York: Academic Press.
- Baddeley, A. D. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20, 417–423.
- Baddeley, A. D., & Warrington, E. K. (1970). Amnesia and the distinction between long- and short-term memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 9, 176–189.
- Bor, D., Cumming, N., Scott, C. E., & Owen, A. M. (2004). Prefrontal cortical involvement in verbal encoding strategies. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 19, 3365–3370.
- Bor, D., Duncan, J., Wiseman, R. J., & Owen, A. M. (2003). Encoding strategies dissociate prefrontal activity from working memory demand. *Neuron*, 37, 361–367.
- Brewer, J. B., Zhao, Z., Desmond, J. E., Glover, G. H., & Gabrieli, J. D. (1998). Making memories: Brain activity that predicts how well visual experience will be remembered [see comments]. *Science*, 281, 1185–1187.
- Buckner, R. L. (2003). Functional–anatomic correlates of control processes in memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 23, 3999–4004.
- Buckner, R. L., Wheeler, M. E., & Sheridan, M. A. (2001). Encoding processes during retrieval tasks. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 13, 406–415.
- Buffalo, E. A., Reber, P. J., & Squire, L. R. (1998). The human perirhinal cortex and recognition memory. *Hippocampus*, 8, 330–339.
- Cabeza, R., Dolcos, F., Graham, R., & Nyberg, L. (2002). Similarities and differences in the neural correlates of episodic memory retrieval and working memory. *Neuroimage*, 16, 317–330.
- Cocosco, C., Kollokian, V., Kwan, R., & Evans, A. (1997). Brainweb: Online interface to a 3D MRI simulated brain database. *Neuroimage*, 5, s425.
- Courtney, S. M., Ungerleider, L. G., Keil, K., & Haxby, J. V. (1997). Transient and sustained activity in a distributed neural system for human working memory. *Nature*, 386, 608–611.
- Craik, F., & Lockhart, R. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 671–684.
- Craik, F. I. (2002). Levels of processing: Past, present, and future? *Memory*, 10, 305–318.
- Craik, F. I., & Watkins, M. J. (1973). The role of rehearsal in short-term memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 12, 599–607.
- Curtis, C. E., & D'Esposito, M. (2003). Persistent activity in the prefrontal cortex during working memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 415–423.
- Curtis, C. E., Rao, V. Y., & D'Esposito, M. (2004). Maintenance of spatial and motor codes during oculomotor delayed response tasks. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 24, 3944–3952.
- Dasselar, S. M., Prince, S. E., & Cabeza, R. (2004). When less means more: Deactivations during encoding that predict subsequent memory. *Neuroimage*, 23, 921–927.
- Davachi, L., Maril, A., & Wagner, A. D. (2001). When keeping in mind supports later bringing to mind: Neural markers of phonological rehearsal predict subsequent remembering. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 13, 1059–1070.
- Davachi, L., Mitchell, J. P., & Wagner, A. D. (2003). Multiple routes to memory: Distinct medial temporal lobe processes build item and source memories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.*, 100, 2157–2162.
- Davachi, L., & Wagner, A. D. (2002). Hippocampal contributions to episodic encoding: Insights from relational and item-based learning. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 88, 982–990.
- Desjardins, A. E., Kiehl, K. A., & Liddle, P. F. (2001). Removal of confounding effects of global signal in functional MRI analyses. *Neuroimage*, 13, 751–758.
- D'Esposito, M., & Postle, B. R. (1999). The dependence of span and delayed-response performance on prefrontal cortex. *Neuropsychologia*, 37, 1303–1315.
- D'Esposito, M., & Postle, B. R. (2000). Neural correlates of component processes of working memory: Evidence from neuropsychological and pharmacological studies. In S. Monsell & J. Driver (Eds.), *Attention and performance: XVIII. Control of cognitive processes* (pp. 579–602). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Duarte, A. L., Ranganath, C., & Knight, R. T. (2004). *Prefrontal cortex supports recollection and familiarity-based recognition: Evidence from patients with unilateral prefrontal lesions*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Cognitive Neuroscience Society, San Francisco.
- Eacott, M. J., Gaffan, D., & Murray, E. A. (1994). Preserved recognition memory for small sets, and impaired stimulus identification for large sets following rhinal cortex ablations in monkeys. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 6, 1466–1478.
- Egorov, A. V., Hamam, B. N., Franssen, E., Hasselmo, M. E., & Alonso, A. A. (2002). Graded persistent activity in entorhinal cortex neurons. *Nature*, 420, 173–178.
- Epstein, C. M., Sekino, M., Yamaguchi, K., Kamiya, S., & Ueno, S. (2002). Asymmetries of prefrontal cortex in human episodic memory: Effects of transcranial magnetic stimulation on learning abstract patterns. *Neuroscience Letters*, 320, 5–8.

- Fernandez, G., & Tendolkar, I. (2001). Integrated brain activity in medial temporal and prefrontal areas predicts subsequent memory performance: human declarative memory formation at the system level. *Brain Research Bulletin*, 55, 1–9.
- Fletcher, P. C., Shallice, T., & Dolan, R. J. (1998). The functional roles of prefrontal cortex in episodic memory: I. Encoding. *Brain*, 121, 1239–1248.
- Frey, S., & Petrides, M. (2000). Orbitofrontal cortex: A key prefrontal region for encoding information. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.*, 97, 8723–8727.
- Frey, S., & Petrides, M. (2002). Orbitofrontal cortex and memory formation. *Neuron*, 36, 171–176.
- Fuster, J. M. (1990). Inferotemporal units in selective visual attention and short-term memory. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 64, 681–697.
- Gershberg, F. B., & Shimamura, A. P. (1995). Impaired use of organizational strategies in free recall following frontal lobe damage. *Neuropsychologia*, 33, 1305–1333.
- Gisiger, T., Kerszberg, M., & Changeux, J. P. (2004). Acquisition and performance of delayed-response tasks: A neural network model. *Cerebral Cortex*.
- Handwerker, D. A., Ollinger, J. M., & D'Esposito, M. (2004). Variation of BOLD hemodynamic responses across subjects and brain regions and their effects on statistical analyses. *Neuroimage*, 21, 1639–1651.
- Hannula, D. E., Cohen, N. J., & Tranel, D. (2003). *Long-term memory for face-scene relations depends critically on the hippocampal system*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Neuroscience, New Orleans, LA.
- Hebb, D. O. (1949). *Organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory*. New York: Wiley.
- Henson, R. N. A., Rugg, M. D., Shallice, T., Josephs, O., & Dolan, R. J. (1999). Recollection and familiarity in recognition memory: An event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 19, 3962–3972.
- Hunt, R. R., & Einstein, G. O. (1981). Relational and item-specific information in memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20, 497–514.
- Jha, A. P., & McCarthy, G. (2000). The influence of memory load upon delay-interval activity in a working memory task: An event-related functional MRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12, 90–105.
- Jiang, Y. (2004). Time window from visual images to visual short-term memory: Consolidation or integration? *Experimental Psychology*, 51, 45–51.
- Johnson, M. K. (1992). MEM: Mechanisms of recollection. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4, 268–280.
- Johnson, M. K., Mitchell, K. J., Raye, C. L., & Greene, E. J. (2004). An age-related deficit in prefrontal cortical function associated with refreshing information. *Psychological Science*, 15, 127–132.
- Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Mitchell, K. J., Greene, E. J., & Anderson, A. W. (2003). fMRI evidence for an organization of prefrontal cortex by both type of process and type of information. *Cerebral Cortex*, 13, 265–273.
- Johnson, M. K., Reeder, J. A., Raye, C. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2002). Second thoughts versus second looks: An age-related deficit in reflectively refreshing just-activated information. *Psychological Science*, 13, 64–67.
- Jolicoeur, P., & Dell'Acqua, R. (1998). The demonstration of short-term consolidation. *Cognitive Psychology*, 36, 138–202.
- Kirchhoff, B. A., Wagner, A. D., Maril, A., & Stern, C. E. (2000). Prefrontal-temporal circuitry for episodic encoding and subsequent memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 20, 6173–6180.
- Kohler, S., Paus, T., Buckner, R. L., & Milner, B. (2004). Effects of left inferior prefrontal stimulation on episodic memory formation: A two-stage fMRI-rTMS study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 16, 178–188.
- Kojima, S., & Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1982). Delay-related activity of prefrontal neurons in rhesus monkeys performing delayed response, 248, 43–49.
- Linden, D. E., Bittner, R. A., Muckli, L., Waltz, J. A., Kriegeskorte, N., Goebel, R., Singer, W., & Munk, M. H. (2003). Cortical capacity constraints for visual working memory: Dissociation of fMRI load effects in a fronto-parietal network. *Neuroimage*, 20, 1518–1530.
- Miller, E. K., Li, L., & Desimone, R. (1993). Activity of neurons in anterior inferior temporal cortex during a short-term memory task. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 13, 1460–1478.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81–97.
- Miyashita, Y., & Chang, H. S. (1988). Neuronal correlate of pictorial short-term memory in the primate temporal cortex. *Nature*, 331, 68–70.
- Munk, M. H., Linden, D. E., Muckli, L., Lanfermann, H., Zanella, F. E., Singer, W., & Goebel, R. (2002). Distributed cortical systems in visual short-term memory revealed by event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Cerebral Cortex*, 12, 866–876.
- Murray, E. A., & Mishkin, M. (1986). Visual recognition in monkeys following rhinal cortical ablations combined with either amygdectomy or hippocampectomy. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 6, 1991–2003.
- Nairne, J. S. (1983). Associative processing during rote rehearsal. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 9, 3–20.
- Nakamura, K., & Kubota, K. (1995). Mnemonic firing of neurons in the monkey temporal pole during a visual recognition memory task. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 74, 162–178.
- Nakamura, K., & Kubota, K. (1996). The primate temporal pole: Its putative role in object recognition and memory. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 77, 53–77.
- Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Jonides, J. (1984a). Cognitive load and maintenance rehearsal. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 23, 494–507.
- Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Jonides, J. (1984b). Maintenance rehearsal: A two-component analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 10, 369–385.
- O'Scalaidhe, S. P., Wilson, F. A., & Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1997). Areal segregation of face-processing neurons in prefrontal cortex. *Science*, 278, 1135–1138.
- Otten, L. J., Henson, R. N., & Rugg, M. D. (2001). Depth of processing effects on neural correlates of memory encoding: Relationship between findings from across- and within-task comparisons. *Brain*, 124, 399–412.
- Otten, L. J., & Rugg, M. D. (2001). When more means less: Neural activity related to unsuccessful memory encoding. *Current Biology*, 11, 1528–1530.
- Owen, A. M., Sahakian, B. J., Semple, J., Polkey, C. E., & Robbins, T. W. (1995). Visuo-spatial short-term recognition memory and learning after temporal lobe excisions, frontal lobe excisions or amygdalo-hippocampectomy in man. *Neuropsychologia*, 33, 1–24.
- Paller, K. A., & Wagner, A. D. (2002). Observing the transformation of experience into memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6, 93–102.

- Park, D. C., Welsh, R. C., Marshuetz, C., Gutchess, A. H., Mikels, J., Polk, T. A., Noll, D. C., & Taylor, S. F. (2003). Working memory for complex scenes: Age differences in frontal and hippocampal activations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15, 1122–1134.
- Pessoa, L., Gutierrez, E., Bandettini, P., & Ungerleider, L. (2002). Neural correlates of visual working memory: fMRI amplitude predicts task performance. *Neuron*, 35, 975–987.
- Postle, B. R., & D'Esposito, M. (1999). "What"—Then—"Where" in visual working memory: An event-related fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 11, 585–597.
- Postle, B. R., Zarah, E., & D'Esposito, M. (2000). Using event-related fMRI to assess delay-period activity during performance of spatial and nonspatial working memory tasks. *Brain Research, Brain Research Protocols*, 5, 57–66.
- Prabhakaran, V., Narayanan, K., Zhao, Z., & Gabrieli, J. D. (2000). Integration of diverse information in working memory within the frontal lobe. *Nature Neuroscience*, 3, 85–90.
- Rami, L., Gironell, A., Kulisevsky, J., Garcia-Sanchez, C., Berthier, M., & Estevez-Gonzalez, A. (2003). Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on memory subtypes: A controlled study. *Neuropsychologia*, 41, 1877–1883.
- Ranganath, C., Cohen, M. X., Dam, C., & D'Esposito, M. (2004). Inferior temporal, prefrontal, and hippocampal contributions to visual working memory maintenance and associative memory retrieval. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 24, 3917–3925.
- Ranganath, C., DeGutis, J., & D'Esposito, M. (2004). Category-specific modulation of inferior temporal activity during working memory encoding and maintenance. *Brain Research, Cognitive Brain Research*, 20, 37–45.
- Ranganath, C., & D'Esposito, M. (2001). Medial temporal lobe activity associated with active maintenance of novel information. *Neuron*, 31, 865–873.
- Ranganath, C., Johnson, M. K., & D'Esposito, M. (2003). Prefrontal activity associated with working memory and episodic long-term memory. *Neuropsychologia*, 41, 378–389.
- Ranganath, C., & Knight, R. T. (2003). Prefrontal cortex and episodic memory: Integrating findings from neuropsychology and event-related functional neuroimaging. In A. Parker, E. Wilding, & T. Bussey (Eds.), *The cognitive neuroscience of memory encoding and retrieval* (pp. 83–99). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Ranganath, C., Yonelinas, A. P., Cohen, M. X., Dy, C. J., Tom, S. M., & D'Esposito, M. (2003). Dissociable correlates of recollection and familiarity within the medial temporal lobes. *Neuropsychologia*, 42, 2–13.
- Raye, C. L., Johnson, M. K., Mitchell, K. J., Reeder, J. A., & Greene, E. J. (2002). Neuroimaging a single thought: Dorsolateral PFC activity associated with refreshing just-activated information. *Neuroimage*, 15, 447–453.
- Reber, P. J., Siwiec, R. M., Gitleman, D. R., Parrish, T. B., Mesulam, M. M., & Paller, K. A. (2002). Neural correlates of successful encoding identified using functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 22, 9541–9548.
- Rissman, J., Gazzaley, A., & D'Esposito, M. (2004). Measuring functional connectivity during distinct stages of a cognitive task. *Neuroimage*, 23, 752–763.
- Rorden, C., & Brett, M. (2000). Stereotaxic display of brain lesions. *Behavioural Neurology*, 12, 191–200.
- Rossi, S., Cappa, S. F., Babiloni, C., Pasqualetti, P., Miniussi, C., Carducci, F., Babiloni, F., & Rossini, P. M. (2001). Prefrontal [correction of Prefrontal] cortex in long-term memory: An "interference" approach using magnetic stimulation. *Nature Neuroscience*, 4, 948–952.
- Rowe, J. B., Toni, I., Josephs, O., Frackowiak, R. S., & Passingham, R. E. (2000). The prefrontal cortex: Response selection or maintenance within working memory? *Science*, 288, 1656–1660.
- Sakai, K., & Passingham, R. E. (2003). Prefrontal interactions reflect future task operations. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6, 75–81.
- Sakai, K., Rowe, J. B., & Passingham, R. E. (2002). Active maintenance in prefrontal area 46 creates distractor-resistant memory. *Nature Neuroscience*, 5, 479–484.
- Sandrini, M., Cappa, S. F., Rossi, S., Rossini, P. M., & Miniussi, C. (2003). The role of prefrontal cortex in verbal episodic memory: rTMS evidence. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15, 855–861.
- Savage, C. R., Deckersbach, T., Heckers, S., Wagner, A. D., Schacter, D. L., Alpert, N. M., Fischman, A. J., & Rauch, S. L. (2001). Prefrontal regions supporting spontaneous and directed application of verbal learning strategies: Evidence from PET. *Brain*, 124, 219–231.
- Schacter, D. L., & Cooper, L. A. (1993). Implicit and explicit memory for novel visual objects: Structure and function. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 19, 995–1009.
- Schacter, D. L., Cooper, L. A., & Delaney, S. M. (1990). Implicit memory for unfamiliar objects depends on access to structural descriptions [see comments]. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 119, 5–24.
- Schacter, D. L., Cooper, L. A., & Valdiserri, M. (1992). Implicit and explicit memory for novel visual objects in older and younger adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 7, 299–308.
- Shallice, T., & Warrington, E. K. (1970). Independent functioning of verbal memory stores: A neuropsychological study. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology: A*, 22, 261–273.
- Shimamura, A. P. (2000). The role of the prefrontal cortex in dynamic filtering. *Psychobiology*, 28, 207–218.
- Stern, C. E., Sherman, S. J., Kirchhoff, B. A., & Hasselmo, M. E. (2001). Medial temporal and prefrontal contributions to working memory tasks with novel and familiar stimuli. *Hippocampus*, 11, 337–346.
- Suzuki, W. A., Miller, E. K., & Desimone, R. (1997). Object and place memory in the macaque entorhinal cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 78, 1062–1081.
- Suzuki, W. A., Zola-Morgan, S., Squire, L. R., & Amaral, D. G. (1993). Lesions of the perirhinal and parahippocampal cortices in the monkey produce long-lasting memory impairment in the visual and tactual modalities. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 13, 2430–2451.
- Vogel, E. K., & Luck, S. J. (2002). Delayed working memory consolidation during the attentional blink. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 9, 739–743.
- Wagner, A. D. (1999). Working memory contributions to human learning and remembering. *Neuron*, 22, 19–22.
- Wagner, A. D., & Davachi, L. (2001). Cognitive neuroscience: Forgetting of things past. *Current Biology*, 11, R964–R967.
- Wagner, A. D., Schacter, D. L., Rotte, M., Koutstaal, W., Maril, A., Dale, A. M., Rosen, B. R., & Buckner, R. L. (1998). Building memories: Remembering and forgetting of verbal

- experiences as predicted by brain activity. *Science*, 281, 1188–1191.
- Williams, P., & Tarr, M. J. (1997). Structural processing and implicit memory for possible and impossible figures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, 1344–1361.
- Williams, P., & Tarr, M. J. (1999). Orientation-specific possibility priming for novel three-dimensional objects. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 61, 963–976.
- Woodward, A. E., Bjork, R. A., & Jongeward, R. H. (1973). Recall and recognition as a function of primary rehearsal. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 12, 608–617.
- Zarahn, E., Aguirre, G., & D'Esposito, M. (1997). A trial-based experimental design for fMRI. *Neuroimage*, 6, 122–138.
- Zola-Morgan, S., & Squire, L. (1985). Medial temporal lesions on monkeys impair memory in a variety of tasks sensitive to human amnesia. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 99, 22–34.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Talya Sadeh, Yoni Pertzov. 2020. Scale-invariant Characteristics of Forgetting: Toward a Unifying Account of Hippocampal Forgetting across Short and Long Timescales. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**:3, 386-402. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
2. Carlyle Farrell. 2020. Do international marketing simulations provide an authentic assessment of learning? A student perspective. *The International Journal of Management Education* **18**:1, 100362. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Ying-hui Chou, Viet Ton That, Mark Sundman. 2020. A systematic review and meta-analysis of rTMS effects on cognitive enhancement in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiology of Aging* **86**, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Elsa Raynal, Armin Schnider, Aurélie L. Manuel. 2020. Early signal from the hippocampus for memory encoding. *Hippocampus* **30**:2, 114-120. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Rebecca J. Melrose, Evan Zahniser, Stacy S. Wilkins, Joseph Veliz, Arpi S. Hasratian, David L. Sultzer, Amy M. Jimenez. 2020. Prefrontal working memory activity predicts episodic memory performance: A neuroimaging study. *Behavioural Brain Research* **379**, 112307. [[Crossref](#)]
6. N. Serrano, D. López-Sanz, R. Bruña, P. Garcés, I. C. Rodríguez-Rojo, A. Marcos, D. Prada Crespo, F. Maestú. 2020. Spatiotemporal Oscillatory Patterns During Working Memory Maintenance in Mild Cognitive Impairment and Subjective Cognitive Decline. *International Journal of Neural Systems* **30**:01, 1950019. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Keisuke Fukuda, Edward K. Vogel. 2019. Visual short-term memory capacity predicts the “bandwidth” of visual long-term memory encoding. *Memory & Cognition* **47**:8, 1481-1497. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Jonathan Strunk, Lauren Morgan, Sarah Reaves, Paul Verhaeghen, Audrey Duarte. 2019. Retrospective Attention in Short-Term Memory Has a Lasting Effect on Long-Term Memory Across Age. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* **74**:8, 1317-1325. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Phui Cheng Lim, Emily J. Ward, Timothy J. Vickery, Matthew R. Johnson. 2019. Not-so-working Memory: Drift in Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Pattern Representations during Maintenance Predicts Errors in a Visual Working Memory Task. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **31**:10, 1520-1534. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
10. Lea M. Bartsch, Vanessa M. Loaiza, Lutz Jäncke, Klaus Oberauer, Jarrod A. Lewis-Peacock. 2019. Dissociating refreshing and elaboration and their impacts on memory. *NeuroImage* **199**, 585-597. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Joshua K. Hartshorne, Tal Makovski. 2019. The effect of working memory maintenance on long-term memory. *Memory & Cognition* **47**:4, 749-763. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Sunee Sirivichayakul, Buranee Kanchanatawan, Supaksorn Thika, André F. Carvalho, Michael Maes. 2019. Eotaxin, an Endogenous Cognitive Deteriorating Chemokine (ECDC), Is a Major Contributor to Cognitive Decline in Normal People and to Executive, Memory, and Sustained Attention Deficits, Formal Thought Disorders, and Psychopathology in Schizophrenia Patients. *Neurotoxicity Research* **35**:1, 122-138. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Robert S. Blumenfeld, Charan Ranganath. The lateral prefrontal cortex and human long-term memory 221-235. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Domilè Tautvydaitė, Aurélie L. Manuel, Louis Nahum, Alexandra Adam-Darqué, Radek Ptak, Armin Schnider. 2018. Absence of an early hippocampal encoding signal after medial temporal lesions: No consequence for the spacing effect. *Hippocampus* **10**. . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Marleen Stelter, Juliane Degner. 2018. Investigating the other-race effect in working memory. *British Journal of Psychology* **109**:4, 777-798. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Lynn J. Lohnas, Katherine Duncan, Werner K. Doyle, Thomas Thesen, Orrin Devinsky, Lila Davachi. 2018. Time-resolved neural reinstatement and pattern separation during memory decisions in human hippocampus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**:31, E7418-E7427. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Mark W. Schurgin, Jonathan I. Flombaum. 2018. Properties of visual episodic memory following repeated encounters with objects. *Learning & Memory* **25**:7, 309-316. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Danlei Chen, J. Benjamin Hutchinson. What Is Memory-Guided Attention? How Past Experiences Shape Selective Visuospatial Attention in the Present 185-212. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Christopher Mole. 2017. Are there Special Mechanisms of Involuntary Memory?. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* **8**:3, 557-571. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Alex Lau-Zhu, Emily A. Holmes, Sally Butterfield, Joni Holmes. 2017. Selective Association Between Tetris Game Play and Visuospatial Working Memory: A Preliminary Investigation. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* **31**:4, 438-445. [[Crossref](#)]



21. James E. Kragel, Youssef Ezzyat, Michael R. Sperling, Richard Gorniak, Gregory A. Worrell, Brent M. Berry, Cory Inman, Jui-Jui Lin, Kathryn A. Davis, Sandhitsu R. Das, Joel M. Stein, Barbara C. Jobst, Kareem A. Zaghloul, Sameer A. Sheth, Daniel S. Rizzuto, Michael J. Kahana. 2017. Similar patterns of neural activity predict memory function during encoding and retrieval. *NeuroImage* **155**, 60-71. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Maxwell B. Merkow, John F. Burke, Ashwin G. Ramayya, Ashwini D. Sharan, Michael R. Sperling, Michael J. Kahana. 2017. Stimulation of the human medial temporal lobe between learning and recall selectively enhances forgetting. *Brain Stimulation* **10**:3, 645-650. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Siri-Maria Kamp, Regine Bader, Axel Mecklinger. 2017. ERP Subsequent Memory Effects Differ between Inter-Item and Unitization Encoding Tasks. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **11**. . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Robert A. Veselis. The Memory Labyrinth: Systems, Processes, and Boundaries 31-62. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Deborah E. Hannula, Jennifer D. Ryan, David E. Warren. Beyond Long-Term Declarative Memory: Evaluating Hippocampal Contributions to Unconscious Memory Expression, Perception, and Short-Term Retention 281-336. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Robert S. Blumenfeld, Charan Ranganath. Prefrontal Cortex and Human Memory: An Integrated Account From the Cognitive Neuroscience of Working and Long-Term Memory # 275-293. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Kathy S. Chiou, Helen M. Genova, Nancy D. Chiaravalloti. 2016. Structural white matter differences underlying heterogeneous learning abilities after TBI. *Brain Imaging and Behavior* **10**:4, 1274-1279. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Heiko C. Bergmann, Sander M. Daselaar, Guillén Fernández, Roy P. C. Kessels. 2016. Neural substrates of successful working memory and long-term memory formation in a relational spatial memory task. *Cognitive Processing* **17**:4, 377-387. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Baoyu Yuan, Jiu Chen, Liang Gong, Hao Shu, Wenxiang Liao, Zan Wang, Duan Liu, Chunming Xie, Zhijun Zhang. 2016. Mediation of episodic memory performance by the executive function network in patients with amnesic mild cognitive impairment: a resting-state functional MRI study. *Oncotarget* **7**:40, 64711-64725. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Elizabeth R. Chrastil, Katherine R. Sherrill, Michael E. Hasselmo, Chantal E. Stern. 2016. Which way and how far? Tracking of translation and rotation information for human path integration. *Human Brain Mapping* **37**:10, 3636-3655. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Yuanjun Xie, Zhengquan Feng, Yuanyuan Xu, Chen Bian, Min Li. 2016. The different oscillation patterns of alpha band in the early and later stages of working memory maintenance. *Neuroscience Letters* **633**, 220-226. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Cindy Eckart, Agata Woźniak-Kwaśniewska, Nora A. Herweg, Lluís Fuentemilla, Nico Bunzeck. 2016. Acetylcholine modulates human working memory and subsequent familiarity based recognition via alpha oscillations. *NeuroImage* **137**, 61-69. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Sen Cheng, Markus Werning. 2016. What is episodic memory if it is a natural kind?. *Synthese* **193**:5, 1345-1385. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Karin Schon, Randall E. Newmark, Robert S. Ross, Chantal E. Stern. 2016. A Working Memory Buffer in Parahippocampal Regions: Evidence from a Load Effect during the Delay Period. *Cerebral Cortex* **26**:5, 1965-1974. [[Crossref](#)]
35. T. P. Zanto, W. C. Clapp, M. T. Rubens, J. Karlsson, A. Gazzaley. 2016. Expectations of Task Demands Dissociate Working Memory and Long-Term Memory Systems. *Cerebral Cortex* **26**:3, 1176-1186. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Alen Hajnal, David A. Bunch, Damian G. Kelty-Stephen. 2016. Pulling out all the stops to make the distance: Effects of effort and optical information in distance perception responses made by rope pulling. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **78**:2, 685-699. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Jonas Persson, Hedvig Söderlund. 2015. Hippocampal hemispheric and long-axis differentiation of stimulus content during episodic memory encoding and retrieval: An activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis. *Hippocampus* **25**:12, 1614-1631. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Emanuel Sousa, Wolfram Erlhagen, Flora Ferreira, Estela Bicho. 2015. Off-line simulation inspires insight: A neurodynamics approach to efficient robot task learning. *Neural Networks* **72**, 123-139. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Kathy S. Chiou, Joshua Sandry, Nancy D. Chiaravalloti. 2015. Cognitive contributions to differences in learning after moderate to severe traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* **37**:10, 1074-1085. [[Crossref](#)]
40. John S.Y. Chan, Qiaofeng Wu, Danxia Liang, Jin H. Yan. 2015. Visuospatial working memory training facilitates visually-aided explicit sequence learning. *Acta Psychologica* **161**, 145-153. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Fumiko Kusunoki Nakamoto, Michiko Tsutsumiuchi, Meiko Hashimoto Maeda, Yoshikazu Uesaka, Katsuhiko Takeda. 2015. Memory impairment following right cerebellar infarction: a case study. *Neurocase* **21**:5, 660-664. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Heiko C. Bergmann, Sander M. Daselaar, Sarah F. Beul, Mark Rijpkema, Guillén Fernández, Roy P. C. Kessels. 2015. Brain activation during associative short-term memory maintenance is not predictive for subsequent retrieval. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
43. M. W. Schurgin, J. I. Flombaum. 2015. Visual long-term memory has weaker fidelity than working memory. *Visual Cognition* **23**:7, 859-862. [[Crossref](#)]

44. Siri-Maria Kamp, Hubert D. Zimmer. 2015. Contributions of attention and elaboration to associative encoding in young and older adults. *Neuropsychologia* **75**, 252-264. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Hannes Ruge, Uta Wolfensteller. 2015. Distinct fronto-striatal couplings reveal the double-faced nature of response–outcome relations in instruction-based learning. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **15**:2, 349-364. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Bonnie van Geldorp, Sophie M. Heringa, Esther van den Berg, Marcel G. M. Olde Rikkert, Geert Jan Biessels, Roy P. C. Kessels. 2015. Working memory binding and episodic memory formation in aging, mild cognitive impairment, and Alzheimer’s dementia. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* **37**:5, 538-548. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Soyun Kim, Adam J. O. Dede, Ramona O. Hopkins, Larry R. Squire. 2015. Memory, scene construction, and the human hippocampus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**:15, 4767-4772. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Joshua J. LaRocque, Adam S. Eichenbaum, Michael J. Starrett, Nathan S. Rose, Stephen M. Emrich, Bradley R. Postle. 2015. The short- and long-term fates of memory items retained outside the focus of attention. *Memory & Cognition* **43**:3, 453-468. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Rachel K. Nauer, Andrew S. Whiteman, Matthew F. Dunne, Chantal E. Stern, Karin Schon. 2015. Hippocampal subfield and medial temporal cortical persistent activity during working memory reflects ongoing encoding. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
50. GrÃ©gory Lecouvey, Peggy Quinette, GrÃ©goria Kalpouzos, BÃ©rengÃ©re Guillery-Girard, Alexandre Bejanin, Julie Gonneaud, Ahmed Abbas, Fausto Viader, Francis Eustache, BÃ©atrice Desgranges. 2015. Binding in working memory and frontal lobe in normal aging: is there any similarity with autism?. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
51. Noga Cohen, Liat Pell, Micah G. Edelson, Aya Ben-Yakov, Alex Pine, Yadin Dudai. 2015. Peri-encoding predictors of memory encoding and consolidation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **50**, 128-142. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Jim M. Monti, Gillian E. Cooke, Patrick D. Watson, Michelle W. Voss, Arthur F. Kramer, Neal J. Cohen. 2015. Relating Hippocampus to Relational Memory Processing across Domains and Delays. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **27**:2, 234-245. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
53. Bradley R. Postle. Neural Bases of the Short-term Retention of Visual Information 43-58. [[Crossref](#)]
54. S. M. Hadi Hosseini, Joel H. Kramer, Shelli R. Kesler. 2014. Neural correlates of cognitive intervention in persons at risk of developing Alzheimer’s disease. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience* **6**. . [[Crossref](#)]
55. Iballa Burunat, Vinoo Alluri, Petri Toivainen, Jussi Numminen, Elvira Brattico. 2014. Dynamics of brain activity underlying working memory for music in a naturalistic condition. *Cortex* **57**, 254-269. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Yuanyuan Li, Fei Li, Ning He, Lanting Guo, Xiaoqi Huang, Su Lui, Qiyong Gong. 2014. Neural hyperactivity related to working memory in drug-naïve boys with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **53**, 116-122. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Helen C. Lückmann, Heidi I.L. Jacobs, Alexander T. Sack. 2014. The cross-functional role of frontoparietal regions in cognition: internal attention as the overarching mechanism. *Progress in Neurobiology* **116**, 66-86. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Alen Hajnal, David A. Bunch, Damian G. Kelty-Stephen. 2014. Going for distance and going for speed: Effort and optical variables shape information for distance perception from observation to response. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **76**:4, 1015-1035. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Kaia L. Vilberg, Michael D. Rugg. 2014. Temporal dissociations within the core recollection network. *Cognitive Neuroscience* **5**:2, 77-84. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Petra Grönholm-Nyman. Can Executive Functions Be Trained in Healthy Older Adults and in Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment? 233-243. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Simon Hanslmayr, Tobias Staudigl. 2014. How brain oscillations form memories — A processing based perspective on oscillatory subsequent memory effects. *NeuroImage* **85**, 648-655. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Robert S. Ross, Matthew L. LoPresti, Karin Schon, Chantal E. Stern. 2013. Role of the hippocampus and orbitofrontal cortex during the disambiguation of social cues in working memory. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **13**:4, 900-915. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Angela A. Manginelli, Nadine Langer, Diana Klose, Stefan Pollmann. 2013. Contextual cueing under working memory load: Selective interference of visuospatial load with expression of learning. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **75**:6, 1103-1117. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Derek Evan Nee, John Jonides. 2013. Neural evidence for a 3-state model of visual short-term memory. *NeuroImage* **74**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Melissa R. Stauble, Laura A. Thompson, Gin Morgan. 2013. Increases in cortisol are positively associated with gains in encoding and maintenance working memory performance in young men. *Stress* **16**:4, 402-410. [[Crossref](#)]

66. Randall E. Newmark, Karin Schon, Robert S. Ross, Chantal E. Stern. 2013. Contributions of the hippocampal subfields and entorhinal cortex to disambiguation during working memory. *Hippocampus* **23**:6, 467-475. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Christian R. Huyck, Peter J. Passmore. 2013. A review of cell assemblies. *Biological Cybernetics* **107**:3, 263-288. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Heiko C. Bergmann, Anne Kiemeneij, Guillén Fernández, Roy P.C. Kessels. 2013. Early and late stages of working-memory maintenance contribute differentially to long-term memory formation. *Acta Psychologica* **143**:2, 181-190. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Abhishek T. Haritha, Kimberly H. Wood, Lawrence W. Ver Hoef, David C. Knight. 2013. Human trace fear conditioning: right-lateralized cortical activity supports trace-interval processes. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **13**:2, 225-237. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Francis Clément, Serge Gauthier, Sylvie Belleville. 2013. Executive functions in mild cognitive impairment: Emergence and breakdown of neural plasticity. *Cortex* **49**:5, 1268-1279. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Karin Schon, Robert S. Ross, Michael E. Hasselmo, Chantal E. Stern. 2013. Complementary roles of medial temporal lobes and mid-dorsolateral prefrontal cortex for working memory for novel and familiar trial-unique visual stimuli. *European Journal of Neuroscience* **37**:4, 668-678. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Heiko C. Bergmann, Mark Rijpkema, Guillén Fernández, Roy P. C. Kessels. 2012. The Effects of Valence and Arousal on Associative Working Memory and Long-Term Memory. *PLoS ONE* **7**:12, e52616. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Sarah R. Rudebeck, Daniel Bor, Angharad Ormond, Jill X. O'Reilly, Andy C. H. Lee. 2012. A Potential Spatial Working Memory Training Task to Improve Both Episodic Memory and Fluid Intelligence. *PLoS ONE* **7**:11, e50431. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Myriam C. Sander, Ulman Lindenberger, Markus Werkle-Bergner. 2012. Lifespan age differences in working memory: A two-component framework. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **36**:9, 2007-2033. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Myriam C. Sander, Markus Werkle-Bergner, Peter Gerjets, Yee Lee Shing, Ulman Lindenberger. 2012. The two-component model of memory development, and its potential implications for educational settings. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **2**, S67-S77. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Marcia K. Johnson, Carol L. Raye, Karen J. Mitchell, Elizabeth Ankudowich. The Cognitive Neuroscience of True and False Memories 15-52. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Bonnie van Geldorp, Heiko C. Bergmann, Johanna Robertson, Arie J. Wester, Roy P.C. Kessels. 2012. The interaction of working memory performance and episodic memory formation in patients with Korsakoff's amnesia. *Brain Research* **1433**, 98-103. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Megan H. Pappesh, Stephen D. Goldinger, Michael C. Hout. 2012. Memory strength and specificity revealed by pupillometry. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* **83**:1, 56-64. [[Crossref](#)]
79. David E. Warren, Melissa C. Duff, Daniel Tranel, Neal J. Cohen. 2011. Observing Degradation of Visual Representations over Short Intervals When Medial Temporal Lobe Is Damaged. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **23**:12, 3862-3873. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)] [[Supplemental Material](#)]
80. Marie-Noëlle Levaux, Frank Larøi, Isabelle Offerlin-Meyer, Jean-Marie Danion, Martial Van der Linden. 2011. The Effectiveness of the Attention Training Technique in Reducing Intrusive Thoughts in Schizophrenia. *Clinical Case Studies* **10**:6, 466-484. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Michael X. Cohen. 2011. Hippocampal-Prefrontal Connectivity Predicts Midfrontal Oscillations and Long-Term Memory Performance. *Current Biology* **21**:22, 1900-1905. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Marvin M. Chun, Marcia K. Johnson. 2011. Memory: Enduring Traces of Perceptual and Reflective Attention. *Neuron* **72**:4, 520-535. [[Crossref](#)]
83. E. J. Ploran, J. J. Tremel, S. M. Nelson, M. E. Wheeler. 2011. High Quality but Limited Quantity Perceptual Evidence Produces Neural Accumulation in Frontal and Parietal Cortex. *Cerebral Cortex* **21**:11, 2650-2662. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Sinéad M. Rhodes, Derek Murphy, Peter J. B. Hancock. 2011. Developmental changes in the engagement of episodic retrieval processes and their relationship with working memory during the period of middle childhood. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* **29**:4, 865-882. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Antony D. Passaro, L. Caitlin Elmore, Timothy M. Ellmore, Kenneth J. Leising, Andrew C. Papanicolaou, Anthony A. Wright. 2011. WITHDRAWN: fMRI correlates of visual working memory: What vs. where. *NeuroImage* . [[Crossref](#)]
86. Alexandra S. Atkins, Patricia A. Reuter-Lorenz. 2011. Neural mechanisms of semantic interference and false recognition in short-term memory. *NeuroImage* **56**:3, 1726-1734. [[Crossref](#)]
87. V. Dinkelacker, M. Grüter, P. Klaver, T. Grüter, K. Specht, S. Weis, I. Kennerknecht, C. E. Elger, G. Fernandez. 2011. Congenital prosopagnosia: multistage anatomical and functional deficits in face processing circuitry. *Journal of Neurology* **258**:5, 770-782. [[Crossref](#)]

88. Nathan Cashdollar, John S Duncan, Emrah Duzel. 2011. Challenging the classical distinction between long-term and short-term memory: reconsidering the role of the hippocampus. *Future Neurology* 6:3, 351-362. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Suellem B. Capettini, Márcio F.D. Moraes, Vânia F. Prado, Marco A.M. Prado, Grace S. Pereira. 2011. Vesicular acetylcholine transporter knock-down mice show sexual dimorphism on memory. *Brain Research Bulletin* 85:1-2, 54-57. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Hongkeun Kim. 2011. Neural activity that predicts subsequent memory and forgetting: A meta-analysis of 74 fMRI studies. *NeuroImage* 54:3, 2446-2461. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Juergen Fell, Nikolai Axmacher. 2011. The role of phase synchronization in memory processes. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 12:2, 105-118. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Derek Evan Nee, John Jonides. 2011. Dissociable contributions of prefrontal cortex and the hippocampus to short-term memory: Evidence for a 3-state model of memory. *NeuroImage* 54:2, 1540-1548. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Lynn Nadel, Oliver Hardt. 2011. Update on Memory Systems and Processes. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 36:1, 251-273. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Brian D. Gonsalves, Neal J. Cohen. 2010. Brain Imaging, Cognitive Processes, and Brain Networks. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 5:6, 744-752. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Max Toepfer, Hans J. Markowitsch, Helge Gebhardt, Thomas Beblo, Christine Thomas, Bernd Gallhofer, Martin Driessen, Gebhard Sammer. 2010. Hippocampal involvement in working memory encoding of changing locations: An fMRI study. *Brain Research* 1354, 91-99. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Adriana Sampaio, Nuno Sousa, Montse Fernández, Cristiana Vasconcelos, Martha E. Shenton, Óscar F. Gonçalves. 2010. Williams Syndrome and Memory: A Neuroanatomic and Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 40:7, 870-877. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Ivanda de Souza Silva Tudesco, Leonardo José Vaz, Marcelle Araújo Silva Mantoan, Erich Belzunces, Maria Helena Noffs, Luís Otávio Sales Ferreira Caboclo, Elza Márcia Targas Yacubian, Américo Ceiki Sakamoto, Orlando Francisco Amodeo Bueno. 2010. Assessment of working memory in patients with mesial temporal lobe epilepsy associated with unilateral hippocampal sclerosis. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 18:3, 223-228. [[Crossref](#)]
98. ZhaoMin Liu, ChunYan Guo, Liang Luo. 2010. Attention and available long-term memory in an activation-based model. *Science China Life Sciences* 53:6, 743-752. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Z. Huang, J.X. Zhang, Z. Yang, G. Dong, J. Wu, A.S. Chan, X. Weng. 2010. Verbal memory retrieval engages visual cortex in musicians. *Neuroscience* 168:1, 179-189. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Charan Ranganath. 2010. Binding Items and Contexts. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 19:3, 131-137. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Jeanne M. Lojovich. 2010. The Relationship Between Aerobic Exercise and Cognition. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation* 25:3, 184-192. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Ilona Henseler, Peter Falkai, Oliver Gruber. 2010. Disturbed functional connectivity within brain networks subserving domain-specific subcomponents of working memory in schizophrenia: Relation to performance and clinical symptoms. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 44:6, 364-372. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Valerie A. Carr, Jesse Rissman, Anthony D. Wagner. 2010. Imaging the Human Medial Temporal Lobe with High-Resolution fMRI. *Neuron* 65:3, 298-308. [[Crossref](#)]
104. M. J. Jutras, E. A. Buffalo. 2010. Recognition memory signals in the macaque hippocampus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:1, 401-406. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Patrick H. Khader, Kerstin Jost, Charan Ranganath, Frank Rösler. 2010. Theta and alpha oscillations during working-memory maintenance predict successful long-term memory encoding. *Neuroscience Letters* 468:3, 339-343. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Henri Hannula, Tuomas Neuvonen, Petri Savolainen, Jaana Hiltunen, Yuan-Ye Ma, Hanne Antila, Oili Salonen, Synnöve Carlson, Antti Pertovaara. 2010. Increasing top-down suppression from prefrontal cortex facilitates tactile working memory. *NeuroImage* 49:1, 1091-1098. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Nikolai Axmacher, Sarah Lenz, Sven Haupt, Christian E. Elger, Juergen Fell. 2010. Electrophysiological signature of working and long-term memory interaction in the human hippocampus. *European Journal of Neuroscience* 31:1, 177-188. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Suzanna Becker, Glenda MacQueen, J. Martin Wojtowicz. 2009. Computational modeling and empirical studies of hippocampal neurogenesis-dependent memory: Effects of interference, stress and depression. *Brain Research* 1299, 45-54. [[Crossref](#)]
109. K. Schon, Y. T. Quiroz, M. E. Hasselmo, C. E. Stern. 2009. Greater Working Memory Load Results in Greater Medial Temporal Activity at Retrieval. *Cerebral Cortex* 19:11, 2561-2571. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Nikolai Axmacher, Sven Haupt, Michael X Cohen, Christian E. Elger, Juergen Fell. 2009. Interference of working memory load with long-term memory formation. *European Journal of Neuroscience* 29:7, 1501-1513. [[Crossref](#)]



111. René Scheeringa, Karl Magnus Petersson, Robert Oostenveld, David G. Norris, Peter Hagoort, Marcel C.M. Bastiaansen. 2009. Trial-by-trial coupling between EEG and BOLD identifies networks related to alpha and theta EEG power increases during working memory maintenance. *NeuroImage* **44**:3, 1224-1238. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Oliver Stock, Brigitte Röder, Michael Burke, Siegfried Bien, Frank Rösler. 2009. Cortical Activation Patterns during Long-term Memory Retrieval of Visually or Haptically Encoded Objects and Locations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **21**:1, 58-82. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
113. Robert A. Veselis, Kane O. Pryor. Propofol Amnesia – What is Going on in the Brain? 215-243. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Dylan D. Wagner, Viviane Sziklas, Krista E. Garver, Marilyn Jones-Gotman. 2009. Material-specific lateralization of working memory in the medial temporal lobe. *Neuropsychologia* **47**:1, 112-122. [[Crossref](#)]
115. M-N. Levaux, J. Vezzaro, F. Larøi, I. Offerlin-Meyer, J-M. Danion, M. Van der Linden. 2009. Cognitive rehabilitation of the updating sub-component of working memory in schizophrenia: A case study. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation* **19**:2, 244-273. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Nikolai Axmacher, Daniel P. Schmitz, Ilona Weinreich, Christian E. Elger, Juergen Fell. 2008. Interaction of Working Memory and Long-Term Memory in the Medial Temporal Lobe. *Cerebral Cortex* **18**:12, 2868-2878. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Maki S. Koyama, Peter C. Hansen, John F. Stein. 2008. Logographic Kanji versus Phonographic Kana in Literacy Acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1145**:1, 41-55. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Ahmed A. Moustafa, Scott J. Sherman, Michael J. Frank. 2008. A dopaminergic basis for working memory, learning and attentional shifting in Parkinsonism. *Neuropsychologia* **46**:13, 3144-3156. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Marie-Laure Grillon, Marcia K. Johnson, Marie-Odile Krebs, Caroline Huron. 2008. Comparing effects of perceptual and reflective repetition on subjective experience during later recognition memory. *Consciousness and Cognition* **17**:3, 753-764. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Robert A. Veselis, Kane O. Pryor, Ruth A. Reinsel, Meghana Mehta, Hong Pan, Ray Johnson. 2008. Low-dose Propofol-induced Amnesia Is Not due to a Failure of Encoding. *Anesthesiology* **109**:2, 213-224. [[Crossref](#)]
121. J. Rissman, A. Gazzaley, M. D'Esposito. 2008. Dynamic Adjustments in Prefrontal, Hippocampal, and Inferior Temporal Interactions with Increasing Visual Working Memory Load. *Cerebral Cortex* **18**:7, 1618-1629. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Gezinus Wolters, Antonino Raffone. 2008. Coherence and recurrency: maintenance, control and integration in working memory. *Cognitive Processing* **9**:1, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Michael X Cohen, Michael V. Lombardo, Robert S. Blumenfeld. 2008. Covariance-based subdivision of the human striatum using T1-weighted MRI. *European Journal of Neuroscience* **27**:6, 1534-1546. [[Crossref](#)]
124. C. Ranganath, R.S. Blumenfeld. Prefrontal Cortex and Memory 261-279. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Björn H. Schott, Emrah Düzel. Chapter 3.8 The multiple roles of dopaminergic neurotransmission in episodic memory 379-396. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Angelle M. Sander, Risa Nakase-Richardson, Fofi Constantinidou, Jeffrey Wertheimer, Diane R. Paul. 2007. Memory Assessment on an Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation Team: A Theoretically Based Framework. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* **16**:4, 316-330. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Luciana A. Izquierdo, Daniela M. Barros, Jaderson Costa da Costa, Cristiane Furini, Carolina Zinn, Martin Cammarota, Lia R. Bevilacqua, Ivan Izquierdo. 2007. A link between role of two prefrontal areas in immediate memory and in long-term memory consolidation. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* **88**:2, 160-166. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Patrick Khader, Charan Ranganath, Anna Seemüller, Frank Rösler. 2007. Working memory maintenance contributes to long-term memory formation: Evidence from slow event-related brain potentials. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **7**:3, 212-224. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Michiel B. de Ruiter, Dick J. Veltman, R. Hans Phaf, Richard van Dyck. 2007. Negative words enhance recognition in nonclinical high dissociators: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage* **37**:1, 323-334. [[Crossref](#)]
130. T. Bengner, T. Malina. 2007. Dissociation of short- and long-term face memory: Evidence from long-term recency effects in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Brain and Cognition* **64**:2, 189-200. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Robert S. Blumenfeld, Charan Ranganath. 2007. Prefrontal Cortex and Long-Term Memory Encoding: An Integrative Review of Findings from Neuropsychology and Neuroimaging. *The Neuroscientist* **13**:3, 280-291. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Klaus Fliessbach, Peter Trautner, Carlos M. Quesada, Christian E. Elger, Bernd Weber. 2007. Cerebellar contributions to episodic memory encoding as revealed by fMRI. *NeuroImage* **35**:3, 1330-1337. [[Crossref](#)]



133. Long Chen, Joseph D. Bohanick, Makoto Nishihara, Jeremy K. Seamans, Charles R. Yang. 2007. Dopamine D1/5 Receptor-Mediated Long-Term Potentiation of Intrinsic Excitability in Rat Prefrontal Cortical Neurons: Ca<sup>2+</sup>-Dependent Intracellular Signaling. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **97**:3, 2448-2464. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Petter Marklund, Peter Fransson, Roberto Cabeza, Karl M. Petersson, Martin Ingvar, Lars Nyberg. 2007. Sustained and Transient Neural Modulations in Prefrontal Cortex Related to Declarative Long-Term Memory, Working Memory, and Attention. *Cortex* **43**:1, 22-37. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Carol L. Raye, Marcia K. Johnson, Karen J. Mitchell, Erich J. Greene, Matthew R. Johnson. 2007. Refreshing: A Minimal Executive Function. *Cortex* **43**:1, 135-145. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Donna Rose Addis, Mary Pat McAndrews. 2006. Prefrontal and hippocampal contributions to the generation and binding of semantic associations during successful encoding. *NeuroImage* **33**:4, 1194-1206. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Carinne Piekema, Roy P.C. Kessels, Rogier B. Mars, Karl Magnus Petersson, Guillén Fernández. 2006. The right hippocampus participates in short-term memory maintenance of object–location associations. *NeuroImage* **33**:1, 374-382. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Jennifer A. Mangels, Brady Butterfield, Justin Lamb, Catherine Good, Carol S. Dweck. 2006. Why do beliefs about intelligence influence learning success? A social cognitive neuroscience model. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* **1**:2, 75-86. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Nikolai Axmacher, Florian Mormann, Guillen Fernández, Christian E. Elger, Juergen Fell. 2006. Memory formation by neuronal synchronization. *Brain Research Reviews* **52**:1, 170-182. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Ingrid R. Olson, Katherine Sledge Moore, Marianna Stark, Anjan Chatterjee. 2006. Visual Working Memory Is Impaired when the Medial Temporal Lobe Is Damaged. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **18**:7, 1087-1097. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
141. Elizabeth A. Nichols, Yun-Ching Kao, Mieke Verfaellie, John D.E. Gabrieli. 2006. Working memory and long-term memory for faces: Evidence from fMRI and global amnesia for involvement of the medial temporal lobes. *Hippocampus* **16**:7, 604-616. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Christian F. Doeller, Bertram Opitz, Christoph M. Krick, Axel Mecklinger, Wolfgang Reith. 2006. Differential hippocampal and prefrontal-striatal contributions to instance-based and rule-based learning. *NeuroImage* **31**:4, 1802-1816. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Christopher Summerfield, Matthew Greene, Tor Wager, Tobias Egner, Joy Hirsch, Jennifer Mangels. 2006. Neocortical Connectivity during Episodic Memory Formation. *PLoS Biology* **4**:5, e128. [[Crossref](#)]
144. C. Ranganath. 2006. Working memory for visual objects: Complementary roles of inferior temporal, medial temporal, and prefrontal cortex. *Neuroscience* **139**:1, 277-289. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Charan Ranganath, Mark D'Esposito. 2005. Directing the mind's eye: prefrontal, inferior and medial temporal mechanisms for visual working memory. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **15**:2, 175-182. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Charan Ranganath, Aaron Heller, Michael X. Cohen, Craig J. Brozinsky, Jesse Rissman. 2005. Functional connectivity with the hippocampus during successful memory formation. *Hippocampus* **15**:8, 997-1005. [[Crossref](#)]